



Core/CE Consultative Group

16/10/2025

Physical meeting call

Draft Minutes of the meeting

1. Welcome and introduction
<p>Z.GAUTIER, together with R. OTTER welcome everybody to the Core/CE Consultative Group and presents today's agenda.</p>
2. Core / CE Program Update
<p>Key considerations and outlook</p> <p>S. VAN CAMPENHOUT presents the key considerations and outlook for both Core and CE.</p> <p><u>Clarifications based on MP questions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• FB in IDA: ID Flow based capacity calculation is already operational (IDCC(a-c)). IDAs and Intraday Continuous trade is still in ATCs. An ATC extraction is performed from the FB domains.• CJEU ruling on the internal CNEC analysis: The CJEU published a court ruling in which Article 5(8)(b) and (c) and Article 5(9) in the DA and ID CCM including an economic efficiency analysis on internal CNECs are annulled. There is no impact on the implementation timeline of the remaining activities. TSOs will request ACER for clarification on the way forward.• The bidding zone review process is under the member states and fall outside the direct scope of the CCRs. <p>Update on delay Celtic Interconnector and next steps</p> <p>S. DUANE informs on the delay of the construction of the Celtic interconnector (CIC) and considerations in the preparations of the EXT // run. New go-live date now moved to Q1 2028.</p> <p><u>Clarifications based on MP questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HVDC connection, therefore ramping rate need to be determined in alignment between RTE/EirGrid.• CIC tries to follow as much as possible the evolved flow based approach for ALEGrO. However, situation is slightly different due to connection different synchronous areas within the same CCR.
3. CE - Day-Ahead Capacity Calculation
<p>NRA approval</p> <p>CE NRAs inform on the approval of the CE DA CCM and the next steps and thank TSOs for the collaboration during the approval process. The deadline for implementation has been set on 15/01/2028 (first formal deadline based on the exchanges between CE TSOs and regulators).</p> <p>CE DACCM</p> <p>L. WACHTER-KOLLMANN present the CE DACCM and highlight the differences compared to the Core process with special attention to the CH integration and the planning for the first amendment.</p> <p><u>Clarifications based on MP questions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For Allocation constraint the same level of transparency is required as for current Core allocation constraints.• CE TSOs are individually responsible for including their networks elements on the CNEC list. During the EXT // run TSOs will publish their CNECs for MPs to evaluate.



- Relieving effect of NTCs: During the capacity calculation process it is unknown to what extent the CH capacities are nominated.
- It is foreseen to have an agreement between CH and CE TSOs, the so called iTCP (integrated technical counterparty). In parallel discussion on political levels are ongoing that govern full integration of CH into SDAC which may consequently replace the iTCP.
- Granularity of CC will remain hourly. Allocation recently switched to 15 min MTU. The same domain is provided all quarters of a single hour. MPs can express their needs by submitting different bids for each quarter. There is current no consideration the change the CC process to 15 min granularity.

ACTIONS

- Core/CE TSOs to clarify why capacity calculation remains in hourly granularity (deadline: Next CG)

4. Long term Capacity calculation

Introduction

P. BRHLIKOVA provides an introduction to the status of LTCC implementation, including deep dive into the LTCCM amendment and benchmark application. She requests MPs to provide feedback on the TSO presented topics.

P. BRHLIKOVA also outlines high level planning of the EXT // run for LTCC and explains that the simulation platform testing organised by JAO is separate from the LTCC EXT // run. For both, Core TSOs provide the grid models and resulting domains that are being used in the capacity calculations. Regarding the simulation platform, MPs will receive access (upon registration via JAO) to familiarise themselves with the new allocation procedure and conditions.

Benchmark application - Rationale for the improvement

P. BRHLIKOVA explains the rationale for the benchmark application and that this is a shift in the paradigm to financial transmission rights and markets.

Market participants explain that for MPs there is a need for sufficient hedging opportunities, else MPs need to manage their portfolio only in the DA market which imposes unacceptable risk.

Clarifications based on MP questions

- Core TSOs acknowledge that implementation of FB in LTCC and allocations lowers the level of control and predictability of hedging opportunities. From CCR perspective TSOs aim at providing stable FB domains, therefore, the benchmark values are introduced for which a prerequisite is the removal of LTA inclusion.
- In line with the LTCCM process, TSOs will provide updated grid models (CGMS from NMFT) and topologies (incl. outages) as an input for each separate LT calculation.
- To ensure adequate benchmarking that reflect updates in the grid and/or market, a yearly review process is envisaged. How this process is set up is subject to further alignment with NRAs.
- For majority of Core borders the yearly and monthly benchmark is initially defined based on historical offered capacities in 2025 JAO auctions.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT explains that also based on input from MPs, Core TSOs shifted their focus from physical transmission rights / operational security to financial markets. Therefore, Core TSOs focus on whether the DA CI is sufficient to fulfil the long term remuneration and assess revenue adequacy in the context of benchmark introduction.

Overview of LTCCM amendment

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the overview of the LTCCM amendment. It is noted that the original LTCCM process remains in place (calculation of timestamp FB domains based on CGM, outage topology and merging of domains) while introduction of historical benchmark and its inclusion in the process is the key update in the LTCCM.

Deep dive on the benchmark

P. BRHLIKOVA explains the rationale behind the benchmark and how the values are set. The RAMs are modified during the CC process so the resulting domain can accommodate the benchmark Min and Max ATC value. The 2025 benchmark values will be added to the LT CCM amendment as an annex and published on JAO platform in line with



publication requirements.

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the TSO assessment of the revenue adequacy. The results shows that the congestion income using the MinMaxATC benchmark meets the remuneration requirements based on the available DA CI and therefore maintains the level of revenue adequacy while offering sufficient capacities.

S. VAN CAMPENHOUT summarises that Core TSOs focus on balancing the volume of LTTR rights against the DA CI, as per the aforementioned shift in paradigm towards financial forward markets.

Clarifications based on MP questions

- Core TSOs acknowledge that the current results use historical bids which could impact the results from simulations and the future bidding strategies are not considered.
- The available DA CI should determine the LTTR rights. TSOs were requested to find measures to increase the FB domain. To achieve this TSOs see it necessary to decouple LTCC and operational security.
- The Min & MaxATC benchmarks are not a fixed parameter. For example, if a high level of CI is used, TSOs can lower the MaxATC level to ensure revenue adequacy. During the amendment process, TSOs in alignment with regulators finetune the process to set the benchmark values. The yearly review loop is aimed at refining the benchmark values which are aimed to be considered for the 2027 yearly calculation. This is a rough ex-ante based statistical approach to facilitate the transition to FB and financial markets. A more sophisticated design to determine the volume of LTTRs is part of the FCA 2.0 discussions (the target model).
- With the move FB CC and allocation, the congestion income and remuneration of LTTRs is computed on regional level (regional pot with socialization). The flow-based set-up implies that the whole CCR (not individual borders) needs to define together the risk level / trade-off how much DA congestion income is to be used for hedging. The essence of this discussion (flow-based or border-by-border approach) is expected to take place the FCA 2.0 discussion.

LTCC implementation timeline and key milestones

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the implementation timeline.

Introduction EXT // run set-up

P. BRHLIKOVA presents the EXT // run set-up. The // run includes yearly 2026 and month 2026 calculation. There are currently no additional yearly runs planned as the input would not change and this should not impact the capacities/allocations as such. From timeline perspective, an additional 2027 computations as part of the EXT // run is not feasible as the input data (CGMs and outage topologies) is only available end of October / November 2026.

P. BRHLIKOVA summarises the paradigm shift from assessing the grid states to calculate capacities to the financial perspective. S. VAN CAMPENHOUT adds that the regulatory approval is a requirement for the implementation of the FB approach. This also includes approval of the removal LTA inclusion in the DA capacity calculation and the IDCC(a) capacity calculation. MPs request that if changes may affect capacity/allocations in the EXT // run, additional runs should be planned and results published accordingly.

ACTIONS

- [Core TSOs to present LTCC EXT // run results \(deadline: Next CG\)](#)

Day-Ahead Capacity Calculation – Removal of LTA Inclusion

P. BAUMANNNS presents analysis on the alpha factor using the 2025 SDAC results.

There are two elements in the discussion when projecting ourselves into the future

- The current LTA levels are not the right counterfactual for a scenario where LTA inclusion is kept. The LTA levels will be different with the go-live of LTCC FB (e.g. DE-AT 4.9 GW political agreement). Assessing operational security in a scenario-based approach looking months/year ahead is likely to lead to a more conservative LTCC flow-based domain compared to the DACC flow-based domain. This would mean that the LTAs would have much less impact in determining the available capacity for cross-zonal trade in day-ahead.
- Core TSOs consider that LTAs do not serve the purpose to enable minimum cross-zonal capacities in day-ahead.



Regulation foresees other means for this.

TSOs want to remove LTA inclusion to enable new and more flexible long-term capacity calculation. The operational process in DA and IDCC(a) shall not be forced to guarantee LT capacities, hence allowing their computation to be more flexible for market needs. Besides that, SDAC capacities could be freed up by switching of extended LTA inclusion as the link with operational security is erased. Already today, the main parts of the socio-economic welfare in SDAC come from the FB domain and not from the LTAs. With further implementation of 70% minMACZT, this share will continue to decline and most likely become obsolete.

Z. VUJASINOVIC (ACER) supports the TSO position, LTAs were to ensure financial compensation. The ACER report show that the impact of LTA inclusion is lowering in the DA market. He sees no issue if more surplus is available and this get redistributes, believing that this is no harm to either the producers or suppliers.

Clarifications based on MP questions

- If the alpha factor is lower than 1 this means part of the LTA domain is used by the market. In 2025 this has only been the case for less than 50 % of the MTUs. However, it does not provide an indication which level of capacities from LTAs are used by the market and how much the market will lose without those capacities. It is therefore acknowledged by TSOs that LTAs are used according to the alpha factor, without any quantification of the impact of their use.
- New LTCC implies that smaller LTAs are expected if LTA inclusion would remain. Hence, lower hedging opportunities would be provided due to the link with operational security.

Z. GAUTIER and F. CESARO on behalf of MPs presents a short analysis on the removal of LTA inclusion, the aim is to create common understanding of the approach of what the impact is of removing LTAs and the impact on the market. MPs see the LTA inclusion as a guarantee for a certain level of capacity in DA, although they know it is not the purpose. MPs believe that the LTA inclusion removal's assessment conducted by TSOs was underestimating the impact on DA capacities. MPs want to stress that LTA inclusion removal may only be possible if TSOs are able to provide strong guarantees for a sufficiently large DA domain. This can be achieved if 70% requirements are respected.

R. OTTER informs that the hardcoded capacities in Dutch legislation disappear with the introduction of LTCC. This is similar to the interstate DE-AT agreement.

P. BAUMANNNS argues that FB optimizes NPs of all BZ simultaneously. If the focus shifts to MAXBEX for individual BZ this rather an argumentation for NTC approach. In case capacities are available in terms of RAM, SDAC could provide higher capacities to the MAXBEX restriction for the borders under consideration if the market wants those capacities

Solution in 4th DACCM amendment

P. BAUMANNNS presents Core TSO proposal on the removal of LTA inclusion.

Clarifications based on MP questions

- Core TSOs consider IVA reductions an appropriate instrument to deal with the exceptional circumstances.
- Core TSOs publish a quarterly report in which it is shown for each TSO how often the 20% minRAM is not provided. Most cases are related to the long-term nomination effect of the HR-SI PTR border. The proposal of Core TSOs addresses this effect because it provides 20% minRAM on top of long-term nominations. The quarterly reports are available on the JAO website ([LINK](#))
- The statistical DFP domain will be computed and published in advance. Core TSOs did not define the publication process yet.

Z. VUJASINOVIC (ACER) explains that ACER supports the TSOs proposal for the statistical DFP domains.

MPs are encouraged to provide their response for the LT CCM amendment and the 4th DA CCM amendment through the public consultation.



ACTIONS

- Core TSOs to clarify when the DA DFP statistical domains will be made available for MPs (deadline; Next CG)

5. Day-Ahead Capacity Calculation – other topics

DA CCM amendment: overview

P. BAUMANNNS presents the overview of the DA CCM 4th amendment.

AHC

P. BAUMANNNS presents the update on AHC. Core TSOs are technically ready for go-live once SDAC/EUPHEMIA is as well. Final go-live date for AHC will be announced well in advance (3 months) before go-live.

Clarifications based on MP questions

- TSOs cannot perform an EXT // run and SPAICC-like runs at the same time due to high involvement of resources for the EXT // run (e.g., operators on shift) . An EXT // run means that the full process is performed next to the currently operational processes. This was discussed and agreed in previous Core CGs.

GLSK harmonisation

MPs request more insights into the GLSK outcomes.

ACTIONS

- Core TSOs to evaluate if it is feasible to perform an additional SPAICC like run for AHC (deadline: TBD)
- Core TSOs to clarify if shadow prices for AHC borders will be published on JAO (deadline: TBD)
- MP to provide the open points for TSOs to consider in additional AHC runs (deadline: TBD)
- Core TSOs to present the outcomes of the GLSK study (deadline: next CG)

6. Intraday Capacity Calculation

Follow up operational process

P. THOMAS presents the status of the operational process since IDCC(c) go-live including the general improvement in BZ isolation. This implies that results are only on from the summer period.

Core TSOs are committed to further stabilise the process to avoid fallback applications.

Fallback triggered BD 25/06/2025

P. THOMAS explains why on IDCC(c) go-live fallback was applied.

ID CCM amendment: overview

P. THOMAS presents the overview of the ID CCM 5th amendment. The public consultation ended on 15/10.

IDCC(d) planning

P. THOMAS presents the overview of all IDCC processes and where IDCC(d) fits in the full IDCC process chain. He informs that TSOs are planning to start the EXT // run on 21/10 with a go-live end of April.

CIS improvement planning

P. THOMAS informs on the improvement on the planning for the CIS (Capacity Improvements Study). The later DACF implementation can mean that a more recent grid model is used which impacts PTDFs. The publication process on the JAO PuTo is not impacted.

minRAM assessment roadmap

P. THOMAS presents the minRAM assessment and assumptions made by TSOs. Furthermore, he explains that minRAM will be applied around RefProg thereby the market direction is already considered.



Clarifications based on MP questions

- A CNEC is not impacted by the minRAM if the MACZT target is already reached.
- The aim of TSOs is to offset the incomplete DACF model and thereby provide improved capacities the ID market.
- Publication details will be clarified if the approach will be implemented. Implementation requires an ID CCM amendment and regulatory approval.

7. Derogations requests from 70% rule 2026

N. SCHOUTTEET (on behalf of NRAs) presents the NRA view on the expected derogation requests and the envisioned process.

Clarifications based on MP questions

- 70% is determined based on Fmax. Based on the published static grid models, it can be assessed what the Fmax is. Additionally, on a daily basis the Fmax for each CNEC is published. Based on this the relevant 70% can be determined. The CCM require TSOs to switch to dynamic Fmax determination. Some TSOs are more advanced in this.
- Different perspectives exist to improve the market integration these differ in term of possible implementation timeline (e.g. grid extension, BZR, renumeration of redispatch, optimized cc calculation).

8. AOB

Z. GAUTIER, R. OTTER and S.VAN CAMPENHOUT thank the CG for their participation.

Next Core CG

- MPs will be informed through the CG distribution list of the meeting dates of 2026. At least 1 meeting will be physical.